DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 744 VT 011 686

AUTHOR	Clary, Joseph Ray
TITLE	Review and Synthesis of Research and Developmental Activities Concerning State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. Information Series No. 22.
INSTITUTION	Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational and Technical Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Sep 70
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Advisory Committees, Federal Legislation, Organization, *Program Administration, Program Evaluation, Program Planning, *Research Needs, *Research Reviews (Publications), State Programs, *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Vocational Education Amendments Of 1968

ABSTRACT

State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education have been appointed in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands in compliance with the Vocational Education Amendments (VEA) of 1968. This report is designed as a summarization, synthesis, and analysis of literature on research and developmental activities of these new Councils. According to the specifications of the amendments, the Councils consist of 12-35 persons who are appointed by the governor, or in some states by the State Board. Functions and responsibilities include advising the State Board on the development and administration of the state plan for vocational education, evaluating programs, services, and activities under the state plan, and submitting an annual report through the State Board to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the National Advisory Council. Few research studies concerning the Councils have been conducted, and the first reports from the Councils are currently being prepared. Needed research areas and questions on the role of and evaluation performed by the Councils are listed. (SB)

Information

Series No. 22

VT 011 686

ED043744

review and synthesis of research and developmental activities concerning

State Advisory Councils On Vocational Education

ERIC

Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education

VT 011 686

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education has been established as an independent unit on The Ohio State University campus with a grant from the Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research, U.S. Office of Education. It serves a catalytic role in establishing consortia to focus on relevant problems in vocational and technical education. The Center is comprehensive in its commitment and responsibility, multidisciplinary in its approach and interinstitutional in its program.

The major objectives of The Center follow:

1. To provide continuing reappraisal of the role and function of vocational and technical education in our democratic society;
2. To stimulate and strengthen state, regional, and national programs of applied research and development directed toward the solution of pressing problems in vocational and technical education;
3. To encourage the development of research to improve vocational and technical education in institutions of higher education and other appropriate settings;
4. To conduct research studies directed toward the development of new knowledge and new applications of existing knowledge in vocational and technical education;
5. To upgrade vocational education leadership (state supervisors, teacher educators, research specialists, and others) through an advanced study and inservice education program;
6. To provide a national information retrieval, storage, and dissemination system for vocational and technical education linked with the Educational Resources Information Center located in the U.S. Office of Education.

ED043744

Information Series No. 22
VT 011 686

REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES CONCERNING STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Joseph Ray Clary

Executive Secretary
North Carolina Advisory Committee
for Vocational and Technical Education
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina

ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education
The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road Columbus, Ohio 43210

September 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

This publication has been prepared for distribution to selected agencies and individuals on a complimentary basis as permitted by funding under the terms of the federal contract. Additional copies have been produced from local funds for distribution on a cost recovery basis to assure wider dissemination of the document.

PREFACE

This *Review and Synthesis of Research and Developmental Activities Concerning State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education* is one of a series of "state-of-the-art" papers in vocational and technical education and related fields. It should assist in identifying substantive problems and methodological approaches for researchers, as well as providing practitioners with a summary of research findings and developmental activities which have application to educational programs. In the field of vocational and technical education, the pace of research and development activities has increased considerably during the period under review. Gaps which exist for some readers are probably the result of the author's prerogative to be selective and the recent emergence of state advisory councils as a topic of interest.

As one of a series of information analysis papers released by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education, this review is intended to provide researchers, curriculum development specialists, and practitioners with an authoritative analysis of the literature in the field. Those who wish to examine primary sources of information should utilize the bibliography. Where ERIC Document numbers and ERIC Document Reproduction Service prices are cited, the documents are available in microfiche and hard copy forms.

The profession is indebted to Joseph R. Clary for his scholarship in the preparation of this report. Recognition is also due Rupert Evans, Chairman, State Advisory Council for Vocational Education, University of Illinois and Michael Russo, Chief, Planning and Evaluation Branch, United States Office of Education for their critical review of the manuscript prior to its final revision and publication. J. David McCracken, Information Specialist at The Center, coordinated the publication's development.

Members of the profession are invited to offer suggestions for the improvement of the review and synthesis series and to suggest specific topics or problems for future reviews.

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational and
Technical Education
ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational
and Technical Education

INTRODUCTION

Each state desiring to receive funds under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 for any fiscal year is required to establish a State Advisory Council on Vocational Education which shall be appointed by the governor or, in the case of states in which members of the State Board for Vocational Education are elected, by that board. The State Advisory Council must be separate and independent from the State Board.

Categories of membership on the Councils are specified in the Act. Specific functions and responsibilities are outlined. The Councils are legally required to meet, select a chairman, and develop rules to cover the time, place, and manner of meeting. The rules must provide for not less than one public meeting each year at which the public is given opportunity to express views concerning vocational education.

The Councils are authorized to develop a staff of such professional, technical, or clerical personnel as are necessary to carry out the functions of the Council. Councils are also authorized to contract for services necessary to carry out their evaluation functions.

Each Council develops an annual budget covering the proposed expenditures of the Council and its staff for the following fiscal year, submits it through the State Board to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, who, after his approval of the budget, will pay to the State Advisory Council the amount requested in its approved budget.

Purposes of this Report

As this review and synthesis is being prepared, State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education have been appointed in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

The Councils are new. They have a designated responsibility clearly defined by Congress unlike previous advisory councils, many of which were inactive, uninfluential, or otherwise ineffective. These new Councils have specific duties and responsibilities. They are free to act—in fact, they must act. There are funds to finance activities of the Councils. Staffs are authorized to provide professional leadership and to assist the Councils in meeting their responsibilities.

The Councils are struggling with questions of status, of identity, of role, of organization, of developing effective relationships with State

Boards of Vocational Education, with State Boards staffs, and with other educational and manpower agencies.

Agencies to be evaluated by the Councils are struggling with the question of how to deal effectively with these new creatures. Are they something to fear, to welcome, to ignore, to involve deeply in policy matters, or to evade? Will they fold their tents and steal silently away after a few years? Will they try to evolve as a competing State Board for Vocational Education?

This report deals with research and developmental activities concerning these new State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. It is designed as a summarization, synthesis, and analysis of significant literature in the area. It should be viewed as a "state-of-the-art" paper in the area of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education.

Scope

This review and synthesis focuses primarily on research and developmental activities of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education created under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. References are made to other Statewide Councils and evaluation activities and to the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education but these references are tangential and do not provide the focus in this effort.

This review and synthesis thus is limited to very recent developments. Dissertations and theses concerning this topic have not yet shown up in the various *Abstracts.* Legal documents, journal articles, speeches, graduate student studies, and mimeographed papers on Council members, rules, organizational structures, minutes, etc. have been used to develop this report. The first *Reports* from the Councils are beginning to be distributed.

Few of the materials used in this report have appeared in the *Abstracts of Research Materials* published by the Clearinghouse for Vocational and Technical Education or in *Research in Education* published by the Educational Resources information Center. Many of the materials used are being processed currently through the Clearinghouse for Vocational and Technical Education for early publication in *Research in Education.* Readers are urged to consult recent editions of *Research in Education* for these documents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii
INTRODUCTION v
Purposes of This Report v
Scope vi
BACKGROUND OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS 3
LEGAL STATUS OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS 7
RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER BOARDS AND AGENCIES 9
Relationship to Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System 9
Relationship to the State Board of Education (or the State Board for Vocational Education) 10
Relationship to the National Advisory Council 10
COMPOSITION OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS 11
ORGANIZING FOR ACTION 14
Organizational Structure 14
Management and Staffing 16
IDENTIFICATION OF ROLE 17
Relative to Evaluation 17
Format for Narrative Report 21
Relative to Policy Assessment 23
Relative to Interface with the Public 25
Relative to State Plan Development 27
STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORTS 30
PROBLEMS AND QUESTIONS CONCERNING STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS 35
The Question of Independence 35
The Question of Appointment of Members 38
The Question of Role 39
Questions on Evaluation 40
The Problem of Communications 41
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 41
Research Needed 42
BIBLIOGRAPHY 43

REVIEW AND SYNTHESIS OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES CONCERNING STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

BACKGROUND OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

Pre-1963 State Committees, Councils and Boards. Evans (1969) discussed the new social agency in each state (the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education) created at the direction of Congress through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-576). He drew a parallel with 1917 when a Federal Board for Vocational Education and State Boards for Vocational Education were created. The Federal Board was to provide policy guidance. State Boards for Vocational Education were to be separate from State Boards of Education. At first both the Federal Board and the State Boards were active and influential. History reveals that frequently State Boards of Education gradually assumed the responsibilities of the State Boards for Vocational Education. In many states the State Board of Education just switched hats when necessary to act as the State Board for Vocational Education. The Federal Board was dissolved after losing its audience.

Burt (1969) reported that for over five decades vocational educators have used business and industry leaders to see that vocational education programs were geared to the needs of students, employers, and society; and to serve as a means of program support from the general public. He estimated that over 100,000 business and industry leaders from throughout the United States currently serve on some 20,000 advisory committees established by secondary and post-secondary schools to assist in the development of vocational and technical education programs. Of course, most of these are local rather than statewide advisory committees.

Hamlin (1967) felt that citizen evaluation of public occupational education is probably the most important factor affecting it. He looked at citizen responsibilities in evaluation from both historical and legal bases. "Towns" in New England set up the first public school systems in the United States. Policy was made at town meetings, which were open to all citizens. School committees were later appointed in the town meetings to evaluate the schools and to report the results of their evaluation efforts back to the town meetings. These committees were the forerunners of local boards of education. Later, boards of education became creatures of the states and board members became, in effect, state officials.

Councils Organized as Result of Vocational Education Act of 1963 (P.L. 88-210). Evans, Mangum, and Pragan (1969) saw Congress, in 1963, giving fundamental and philosophical attention to vocational education for the first time since 1917. The primary objective of the 1917 Smith-

Hughes Vocational Education Act was to meet the needs of the labor market in two specific areas. The 1963 Act reflected a growing sensitivity to human welfare; its emphasis was on the people needing skills rather than upon occupations needing skilled people. An evaluation system was built into the Act. Part of that process was the appointment of a National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. This Council was charged with appraising the results of the Act and with recommending administrative and legislative improvements. The National Advisory *Council* was an *ad hoc* council to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare charged with reviewing the administration of all vocational education programs and making recommendations for administrative and legislative changes. The Act also established a National Advisory *Committee* to the U.S. Commissioner of Education which was merely advisory in a general way in the administration of the various vocational education programs.

In addition to the National Advisory Committee on Vocational Education, similar state committees had to be established to enable vocational education experts and representatives from management, labor, and the general public to participate in the planning and administration of these programs. These were made mandatory by the Act (1963) in all states where "persons familiar with the vocational education needs of management and labor in the state" were not represented on the State board administering vocational education.

Evans, Mangum, and Pragan (1969) indicated their belief that the advisory committees in many states failed to come to grips with their statutory duties. They felt that state committees needed serious leadership from the Office of Education through guidelines and publications, including "how-to-do-it" instructions.

Clary (1970) appeared to document partially the above belief when he reported that, to his knowledge, the North Carolina State Advisory Committee was never called together for a single meeting.

Other Statewide Councils, Commissions and Study Groups. Since 1963, a great many Statewide Councils, Commissions, and Study Groups have been formed to study vocational and technical education programs specifically or have done so in connection with more broadly based activities. State Boards of Education have also contracted for evaluations with private consulting firms or with other public agencies. A few of these have been selected for highlighting below as illustrations of these types of activities.

Vocational Education in Utah. The Utah Department of Public Instruction used the Division of Surveys and Field Services, George Peabody College for Teachers (1966), to conduct a comprehensive study of the vocational-technical education in that state. The study was conducted from a statewide point of view with concerns for state goals, programs, and policies. The survey staff consisted of 15 individuals drawn from 12 different states.

The use of a survey team of specialist consultants may be a technique of value to State Advisory Councils in fulfilling their evaluation responsibilities.

Evaluation of Arkansas Vocational Training Programs in Relation to Economic Development. In April and May, 1969, a three-part study of Arkansas' vocational training needs as they relate to the state's economic development problems was released. The study was conducted by the Industrial Research and Extension Center, College of Business Administration, University of Arkansas, and the W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research (1969). It was undertaken as a result of the recognition of need for a more carefully planned strategy for vocational education efforts as a contributing factor to the economic growth of Arkansas. The results were reported in three parts: Part I—Occupational Needs and Employment Projections; Part II—Survey of Vocational Schools Performance; and Part III—Evaluation of Programs and Recommendations.

A Gateway to Higher Economic Levels: Vocational-Technical Education to Serve Missouri. In 1965 and 1966, Dr. J. Chester Swanson (1966) directed a study of vocational-technical education in the public schools of Missouri. The study group looked into and made recommendations in the areas of: The State Organization for Administration, Supervision and Research in Vocational-Technical Education; Vocational Education in High Schools; Area Vocational Schools; Vocational-Technical Education Beyond the High School; Vocational-Technical Education for Youth and Adults at Work; Vocational Education for Youth and Adults with Special Needs; Ancillary Services to Vocational-Technical Education; and Financing Vocational-Technical Education in Missouri.

Improving Opportunities for Vocational-Technical Education in Montana. This study made by School Survey Service (1968), used a survey staff of 10 professional persons from outside Montana. The procedures used included visitations, conferences, and interviews with both lay and professional persons; the study of relevant records and reports; and a variety of data-gathering instruments. The group studied and made recommendations concerning each of the service areas in vocational education and, in addition, looked at vocational guidance and occupational information services.

Educational Needs in Montana: An Analytic Study. This study by Arthur D. Little, Inc. (1970), provides another example of studies made by private firms. Although looking at the total educational program, one part dealt specifically with vocational-technical education and much of the report had implications for vocational-technical education.

A Policy and System Study of California Vocational Education. This two-year study of vocational education in California was conducted for the California State Board of Education by Arthur D. Little, Inc., (1970). Its main purposes included: 1) a review of the present status

of vocational education in California, 2) a projection of future needs for and in vocational education, 3) an evaluation of the manner in which the existing program is meeting current needs, and 4) recommendations for future development of vocational education. A framework for program development of a new, comprehensive, and integrated approach to education and work was suggested.

The Challenge and The Chance: Research Report Volume II, Public Education in Texas—Program Evaluation. This report on program evaluation was one of five detailed research volumes resulting from the Governor's Committee on Public School Education (Texas, 1969) charged with making a persuasive study of public education in Texas and preparing a specific long-range plan. One part of the study focused on vocational education.

Occupational Education for the Public Schools of North Carolina. This supplementary report (n.d., c.a. 1968) of the Governor's Study Commission on the Public School System of North Carolina was made by a 20-member Advisory Committee on Vocational Education. Recommendations in 11 areas were made by this group. The recommendations were presented to the Governor's Study Commission whose report, *A Child Well Taught,* (1968) had many implications and recommendations concerning occupational education programs. The 17-member Commission was assisted in its study by a professional staff and nearly 500 citizens of the state organized into nine advisory committees and 35 subcommittees.

Highlights and Recommendations for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education. This West Virginia Legislative Study of Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education (1968) was made by state staff members with the use of outside consultants. The study group was directed to review, examine, and study the status of vocational, technical, and adult education; to study the needs for the development of these programs; the ways and means for such development; and the kinds of programs that were feasible and advisable. It looked at the character, scope, and diversity of work in vocational, technical, and adult education programs by several educational agencies in West Virginia and also at the concern of many people about the need for vocational education in the state.

North Dakota Vocational Education Master Plan Committee Report. Seventy-eight recommendations from the Master Plan Committee were made to the North Dakota State Board for Vocational Education in this report (1969). Approximately 125 citizens of North Dakota participated on committees studying such areas as Administration, Finance, Guidance, Research and Evaluation, Teacher Education, Program Development, Adult Education, Post-Secondary Education, Secondary Education, Special Needs, Facilities, and Public Information.

A State Master Plan for Vocational Education. In response to a Resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, a study was made

using three outside consultants and over 50 professional personnel from educational and manpower agencies in Hawaii. One result of the study was the development of a Master Plan for Vocational Education in Hawaii (1968).

Progress Report of the Governor's Committee on Vocational-Technical Education. This Progress Report (1968) reflected the work of approximately 100 Wyoming citizens appointed to the Governor's Committee on Vocational-Technical Education charged with inventorying Wyoming's vocational and technical training facilities, devising a plan with continuity, and reporting its findings and recommendations. Eight subcommittees were formed as follows: World of Work, Ancillary Services, Needs of Industry, Adult, Special Needs, High Schools, and Post-Secondary.

Councils Organized as Result of Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. P.L. 90-576 (1968) required the establishment of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education in all states desiring to receive funds under the Act. Councils must be established and certified not less than 90 days prior to the beginning of any fiscal year.

All 50 States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia have established and properly certified State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education which meet the requirements of the Act.

LEGAL STATUS OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

Hamlin (1967) reported that prior to 1963, most citizens' advisory committees had no legal status. They were merely creatures of the policy bodies which established them. This changed for state advisory committees appointed under the provisions of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 which required that each state receiving funds must have an advisory committee. The committees, however, did not have to be composed of lay citizens.

Evans, Mangum, and Pragan (1969) reviewed the mandate under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 that State Advisory Councils be appointed in all states desiring to receive grants, and the mandates as to their appointment, membership, duties and responsibilities, and meetings.

Burt (1969) pointed to the legally mandated functions of the newly created State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education (as required by P.L. 90-576) as the basis for ushering in a new era of industry-education cooperation in the field of vocational-technical education. He discussed the unique features of the Act in terms of the requirement that in order for a state to receive aid, it must formally organize

a select group of [volunteer] business, community, and educational leaders to serve in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education. The Act also explicitly described the functions and responsibilities of the State Advisory Councils and authorized funds to carry out these functions and responsibilities.

Councils Established by State Statutes. The Legislature of the State of Texas (1969) passed a law creating the Texas Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education to coordinate and develop programs for technical and vocational training in state educational institutions. Section 3 of the Act specified the purpose of the Council "to cause to be established a climate conducive to the development of technical, vocational, and manpower training in educational institutions in the State of Texas to meet the needs of industrial and economic development of the state."

Burt (1969) viewed the action of the Texas Legislature as making the Council almost co-equal with the State Board for Vocational Education. He found two provisions of the Act especially intriguing: one, that recommendations of the Council submitted to the State Board for Vocational Education must be acted upon, and either accepted or rejected; and, two, that any rejected recommendations must be returned immediately to the Council.

The General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (1969) enacted a bill entitled, "An Act to Create a State Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education in Keeping With Federal Requirements, . . ." and thus legally created that Council.

The California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training was created pursuant to Assembly Bill No. 1820 (1969) which passed the California Assembly on August 8, 1969.

It is likely that other General Assemblies of other states will enact statutes concerning State Advisory Councils in the near future.

Councils Established by Governors. The Rules and Regulations for State Vocational Education Programs published in the Federal Register, Volume 35, Number 4 (HEW, 1970) specified that in each state where the members of the State Board are appointed rather than elected, the members of the State Advisory Council shall be appointed by the governor and the Council shall be separate and independent from the State Board.

State Advisory Councils in a number of states have been established through the appointment of members to the Council by the governors of the respective states. For example, the South Carolina Advisory Council on Vocational Education was established by an Executive Order (1970) of Governor Robert B. McNair on February 12, 1970. The Executive Order specified that the Council was being established for the purposes of Section 104 (B) of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended

by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-576). The appointment of persons to membership on the Council was made as part of the Executive Order.

Councils Established By Action of State Boards. The Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) referred to in the preceding section specified that in states in which members of the State Board are elected, the board shall appoint members of the State Advisory Council. In order for this power to be vested in the State Board, a majority of its members must be individuals elected directly by the eligible voters of the state or of the districts which the individuals represent.

The Nevada State Vocational-Technical Education Advisory Council is an example of a Council established by action of a State Board.

The code of By-Laws of the Nevada Council (n.d., c.a. 1970) indicated that the membership of the Council would be appointed by the board and confirmed by the governor.

Certification. The establishment and membership of State Advisory Councils must be certified to the United States Commissioner of Education not less than 90 days prior to the beginning of any fiscal year. This certification is made by the governor in those states establishing an advisory council appointed by the governor or by the State Board when that body establishes the council and appoints its members.

RELATIONSHIPS TO OTHER BOARDS AND AGENCIES

Relationship to Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System.

Interagency Cooperative Issuance Number 69-6 (1969) reviewed the sections of P.L. 90-576 relating directly to Cooperative Area Manpower Planning Systems (Camps). It reviewed the requirement that the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 required the establishment of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. Since the duties of the Councils had major manpower implications, recognition was given to the need to coordinate with the state CAMPS committee. This was reflected in the subsection requiring that a person or persons from the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System of the state be included on each State Advisory Council, but not vice versa.

Recognition of the need for interagency cooperation in developing State Plans for Vocational Education and local plans for Vocational Education was given throughout the Act. Required in the State Plans were inclusion of cooperative arrangements with the State Employment Service and other organizations concerned with manpower needs and job opportunities. Other sections required joint activities or consultations with both government and nongovernment agencies on the local, state,

and federal levels. One specific reference was made to coordination with CAMPS or similar organizations at the local area level. This section required local educational agencies to include in their applications to the state, "A plan, related to the appropriate cooperative area manpower plan, (if any), for meeting the vocational education needs in the area or community. . . ."

The Annual Evaluation Report required by each State Advisory Council has implications for a close relationship in connection with area and state CAMPS plans. The Councils should analyze the effectiveness of vocational education programs in the state and recommend needed changes. It is apparent that this report will have a close relationship to the continuing appraisal of manpower development programs. This suggests a need to coordinate the collection of information and the preparation of analyses with appropriate CAMPS committees.

Relationship to the State Board of Education (or the State Board for Vocational Education).

P.L. 90-576 (1968) and the Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) indicate that the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education is to *advise* the State Board on the development of and policy matters arising in the administration of the State Plan for Vocational Education and to advise on the preparation of long-range and annual program plans. Before approving State Plans, the commissioner is required to determine that the plan has been prepared in consultation with the State Advisory Council. A statement is to be included in the State Plan describing the consultation with the State Board on its plan.

The Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) specify that the annual evaluation report prepared by the State Advisory Council is to be submitted through the State Board to the commissioner and the National Advisory Council.

The State Board was designated in the Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) as the agency to act as fiscal agent for the State Advisory Council. The Council was to submit its annual budget covering the proposed expenditures of the State Advisory Council and its staff for the following fiscal year through the State Board. Subsequent changes in regulations and administrative procedures provided that funds appropriated for the councils would go directly to the Councils from the Office of Education to be used at the sole discretion of the Councils for the employment of staff and for evaluations and studies.

Relationship to the National Advisory Council

The only reference in either P.L. 90-576 (1968) or the Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) to the relationship of State Advisory Councils to

the National Advisory Council concerns submission of the annual evaluation report. This report is to be prepared and submitted through the State Board to the commissioner and the National Advisory Council on or before October 1 of each year in accordance with procedures established by the commissioner.

COMPOSITION OF STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

Burt (1969) emphasized the importance of members of the State Advisory Councils being at the same peer level as members of the board for vocational education, having the same degree of prestige in their communities and in the state, and holding roughly similar status positions in their companies and organizations. He believed this important to the extent to which the board would be influenced by the deliberations and recommendations of the Council. Burt indicated that his analysis of a number of council membership lists showed that council members did hold responsible executive and administrative positions in their organizations and communities. He had not determined whether these positions were at the same level as those of members of the State Boards.

Evans (1969) grouped into four general types the legally specified members of councils. The first type of representation was from those who are or should be served by vocational and technical education—persons who know the vocational needs and problems of management and labor, persons representing the state industrial and economic development agencies, persons representative of the poor and disadvantaged, and persons having additional knowledge of the educational needs of the physically and mentally handicapped.

The second type included persons closely involved with vocational education—persons familiar with administration of state and local vocational programs, persons knowledgeable about vocational education but *not* involved in administration of state or local programs, and persons familiar with programs of technical and vocational education including programs in comprehensive secondary schools.

A third type represented educational agencies within which much of vocational and technical education exists—representatives of post-secondary or adult education agencies or institutions, representatives of local educaton agencies, representatives of school boards, and persons representing school systems with heavy proportions of disadvantaged students.

The fourth type appeared to be an attempt to secure coordination at the state level—there had to be one or more persons from the Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning System of the state.

Burt (1969) thought the distinction between "representative of"

and "representing" was important. He suggested that in the latter instance there was the connotation that special interest groups would submit names of candidates to the appointing authority whom they considered as acceptable to represent their viewpoints. In the former instance, acceptability to special interest groups would not be a concern so long as appointees were familiar with and had knowledge and interest in the field of the special interest group.

Burt (1969) indicated that while the Act did not establish any limit to the number of persons to be appointed to a State Council, it had been determined by various authorities that a minimum of 12 members would be needed to meet all the representation requirements. Nevertheless, a study by Puckett, McKeever, and Fee (1970) reported finding that council memberships ranged from a low of nine to a high of 35. The average membership of councils was found to be approximately 20.

Burt (1969) was of the opinion that 50 percent of advisory council members should be representatives of business and industry since employers, as a group, are representative of the major "power structure" of a state.

The Arkansas General Assembly (1969) enacted a Bill creating the Arkansas State Advisory Council on Vocational Education and legislated that members be appointed by the governor and that the appointments include one or more representatives from the following classifications:

Industrial management
Business management
Labor unions
Agriculture
Health occupations
Home economists
Secondary school administrators with large numbers of disadvantaged students
School boards
House of Representatives
Senate
Arkansas Industrial Development Commission
CAMPS representative of the Employment Security Division
Arkansas Rehabilitation Service
Vocational-Technical Education Division of the State Department of Education
Post-secondary institutions offering vocational-technical education
Persons knowledgeable about the disadvantaged not qualified in the above categories.

The California General Assembly (1969) specified who three of the members of the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training should be and specified that 20 additional members were to be appointed by the governor.

Terms of Appointment—Rotation of Members. The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (1968) did not specify any terms of appointment for State Advisory Council members nor specify any type of rotation of members. This was in contrast to specifications for the National Advisory Council which established three-year terms of office except for initial appointments and appointments to fill vacancies. On the initial appointments, the Act specified that seven members were to be appointed for terms of one year each and seven members for two years each. Appointments to fill vacancies were to be only for the unexpired terms.

Burt (1969) found that several of the councils were adopting three-year terms of office with one-third of the members rotating off after each year.

The Arkansas General Assembly (1969) directed that the governor make appointments for two-year terms with initial appointments made with one-half the members serving for one year and one-half for terms of two years. Reappointment of members was allowed.

In the "Operational Procedures" of the Nebraska Council (n.d., c.a. 1969) appointment of members was to be by the State Board with certification to the U.S. Commissioner of Education to be made by the governor. By lot determination, one-third of the members were to serve for one year, one-third for two years and one-third for three years. Reappointment was to be made at the discretion of the StateBoard. It is assumed that subsequent appointments would be for three-year terms except in cases of appointments to fill unexpired terms.

The Texas Legislature (1969) created a council of 21 members to be appointed by the State Board of Education for six-year terms after recommendation by the governor and subject to confirmation by the Senate. On initial appointments, seven Were to be made for a term expiring August 31, 1971, seven to expire August 31, 1973, and seven to expire August 31, 1975, or at the time their successors are appointed and qualified.

The Mississippi Council (n.d., c.a. 1969) was appointed with initial terms of appointment for three members each for five years, four years, three years, two years and one year.

Since most states have not published materials indicating terms of appointment, it would appear that the members of a number of councils are appointed to serve "at the pleasure of the governor" as in North Carolina or at the pleasure of the State Board.

ORGANIZING FOR ACTION

Organizational Structure

Puckett, McKeever and Fee (1970) found that even in the first year of operation, nearly three-fourths of the Councils has organized some sort of committee structure with a range of committees from one to eight. The average number of committees per Council was four. The most frequently mentioned committee was a Steering or Executive Committee. This study revealed 12 substantive committee areas, listed below in order of frequency of response.

(1) Budgeting, Financing, Funding, Resources, and Legislation

(2) Programs, Operation, Services, and Activities

(3) Evaluation, Planning, Research, and Special Studies

(4) State Plan Evaluation, Guidelines, and Recommendations

(5) Personnel, Professional Development, and Teaching Training

(6) Business and Industrial Development, Industrial Skills, Employment and Manpower Needs

(7) Attitude Toward Individual Involvement and Philosophy

(8) Public Information, Public Meetings, Public Relations, Publications and Reports

(9) State Affiliations, Structural Relationships, and Institutional Relationships

(10) Ancillary Services

(11) Exemplary Programs and Projects

(12) Visitation

Clary (1970) reported that the North Carolina State Advisory Council had divided itself into seven committees in order to work most effectively in discharging its responsibilities. These were: Steering Committee, Personnel Committee, State Plan Committee, Legislation and Funding

Committee, Special Studies and Evaluation Committee, Program Operations Committee, and Professional Development Committee. The committees meet as needed between regular quarterly Council meetings.

An example of the work and output of one of the North Carolina Council committees is a position paper prepared by the Professional Development Committee (North Carolina, 1970) entitled, "Professional Development of Administrators, Vocational Education Teachers, and Support Personnel for Occupational Education Programs in North Carolina." The paper was adopted as an official position of the Council, printed and widely distributed.

The Virginia State Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1970) and the South Carolina Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1970) have adopted committee structures similar to the North Carolina structure. The Virginia Council "Bylaws and Organization" call these Standing Committees. In addition, the Chairman may designate ad hoc committees as seen necessary for the needs of the Council.

The First Annual Report of the State of Illinois Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1969) indicated that working committees had been selected in the following areas:

1. Relationship of State Structure (State Board, Junior College Board, Higher Education Board, State Superintendent, National Council).
2. Relationship Between Institutions (Elementary, Secondary, Area Schools, Junior Colleges, Technical Institutes, Community College and Universities.
3. Committee on Exemplary Programs and Projects in Vocational Education (groups not presently well served).
4. Committee on Cooperative Vocational Education Programs.
5. Committee on Attitude Toward Vocational Education (Vocational Guidance, Student Recruitment, Public Information).
6. Committee on Private Industry Involvement in Vocational Education.

The Nebraska State Advisory Council "Operational Procedures" (n.d., c.a. 1969) specify that special ad hoc committees may be appointed from the membership by the chairman as the needs arise.

The Washington State Advisory Council in its "First Report" (1970) described its structure. It reported a committee structure of only two major committees—the Planning and Evaluation Committee and the Administrative and Budget Committee—augmented by contracted services to carry out its functions during the first year of operation.

Burt (1969) went into some detail in discussing organizational structure for Council. He speculated that "probably because of the danger that any specific language in P.L. 90-576 dealing with the internal organizational

structure of the State Advisory Councils might be considered 'invasion of state rights,' the law calls only for the scheduling of the first meeting, election of a chairman, and the convening of at least one annual public meeting." It was clearly implied in the Act that each State Council was free to develop its own form of governance, internal structure, manner of operation, staffing pattern, and utilization of allocated funds.

According to Burt (1969), the strategy adopted by each council in developing evaluative judgments and recommendations for consideration by State Boards and other involved state and national agencies and officials will determine its organizational structure. Other factors affecting organizational structure include such things as the amount of time members of the Council can afford to give to it, the amount, type and sources of information needed for the Council to reach knowledgeable and informed opinions, and the vast array of interrelated problems affecting vocational and technical education.

Taking the above factors into account, Burt (1969) suggested an organizational structure for Councils which included industry committees, district advisory councils, and local school system advisory committees. The industry committees would assure a continuous flow of information from the industry and business groups of a state as to vocational and technical education needs and problems. Examples would include such committees as a communications industry committee, a food service and hospitality industry committee, a merchandising and distribution committee, a health occupations committee, and an agriculture committee. An alternative to this might be the appointment of executives of statewide trade associations of major industry groups as ex-officio members of the Council. *District advisory councils* would help assure that the Council was familiar with the education, manpower, and economic development programs and problems of the various geographic areas of the state. District Councils would be chaired by a member of the State Advisory Council and made up of representatives of all the major industrial, business, economic, and educational interests in the geographic area served. *Local school system advisory committees* usually involve from five to 10 representatives from local business, industry, and the professions for which the schools are offering programs of occupational education and training. These could be most important resource groups for State Advisory Councils.

Management and Staffing

Section 102.25 of the Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) provided that "each State Advisory Council is authorized to obtain the services of such professional, technical, and clerical personnel as may be necessary to enable the Council to carry out its functions . . . . and to contract for such

services as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its evaluation functions." Members of the State Board are prohibited from serving on the staff of the Council.

The Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) also directed that such personnel as are employed by the Council "shall be subject only to the supervision and direction of the State Advisory Council with respect to all services performed by them for the Council." The rules of a number of State Councils also contain this directive or a direct reference to it.

Burt (1969) seemed to favor the appointment of a full-time director with successful executive and administrative experience. He discussed the qualifications and abilities needed by a director. These included:

1. Skill in arranging for large and small meetings; preparing agendas; writing reports; developing cooperative working relationships and flow of information with other agencies and organizations in the education and manpower field.
2. Able to deal with executives in such fields as industry, labor, education, and the professions; able to deal with legislative and community leaders.
3. Willing to travel and attend meetings of groups interested in and concerned with vocational and technical education.
4. Able to provide leadership, guidance, and advice to local school advisory committees and the various committees of the Council.
5. Serve as representative of the Council.
6. Maintain excellent cooperative relationships with the staff of the State Department of Education and members of the State Board for Vocational Education.

Evans (1969) was complimentary of Congress for recognizing that the duties and responsibilities given the Councils would be "only so much window dressing" if Councils were not also given funds and the right to employ a staff and to contract for services needed in meeting its responsibilities. Evans noted that, "A Council which can devote its attention to policy formation and a Council staff which can concentrate on evaluation can accomplish a very great deal." The fact that the great majority of Councils received an annual budget of less than $25,000 through much of the 1970 fiscal year, however prevented most of them from employing a full-time staff.

IDENTIFICATION OF ROLE

Relative to Evaluation

P. L. 90-576 (1968) specified that one of the duties of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was to evaluate vocational

education programs, services, and activities and publish and distribute the results thereof. It also specified that the State Advisory Council should prepare and submit through the State Board to the commissioner and to the National Council an annual evaluation report, accompanied by such additional comments of the State Board as the State Board deems appropriate, which: 1) evaluates the effectiveness of vocational education programs, services, and activities carried out in the year under review in meeting the program objectives set forth in the State Plan for Vocational Education, and 2) which recommends such changes in such programs, services, and activities as may be warranted by the evaluations.

Evans (1969) suggested that of the duties specified for State Advisory Councils, the one most likely to be significant was the annual evaluation report. This report must evaluate the effectiveness of vocational education in terms of annual and long-range program plans. In addition, it will recommend changes in programs, services, and activities which are called for as a result of the evaluation. Real evaluation in education is just beginning. The rationale, techniques, and procedures developed in evaluating vocational and technical education programs should be useful in evaluating all of education. In the event that this type of evaluation works successfully in the field of vocational and technical education, it is likely that this technique will be adopted for evaluation of other fields of education.

The Federal Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) specified that a State Advisory Council may be able to contract for such services as are necessary to enable it to carry out its evaluation functions. In addition to the evaluation carried on by the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, the Rules and Regulations also specify that the State Board shall be responsible for assuring that state and local programs, services, and activities carried out under the State Plan will be evaluated periodically. In carrying out its evaluation responsibilities the State Board may utilize the evaluations made by the State Advisory Council.

The Federal Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) also provided that the annual evaluation report of the State Advisory Council may be accompanied by comments of the State Board. These comments may include the results of evaluations which support, supplement, or differ with the evaluation results of the State Advisory Council. The evaluations carried out by the State Board of Education may provide the basis for the State Board's comments on the state evaluation report submitted by the State Advisory Council.

Hamlin (1967) discussed citizen responsibilities in evaluation and indicated that the function of the first school committees in this country was to evaluate the schools and report their evaluations at town meetings. He indicated that although the forms by which the evaluation function is exercised have changed, citizens have always retained it. These evalua-

tions are sometimes expressed in the creation of public opinion, in the election of board members and other officials, proposals for and reactions to legislation, and providing or withholding funds for particular kinds of education.

Hamlin (1967) reported that much of the discontent with citizen evaluation results from citizen judgments made with too little supporting evidence. If the evaluations made by citizens committees are not to be discredited completely, responsibilities for evaluation must be delegated to carefully selected citizens who will give the necessary time to it and also use the knowledge and wisdom of professional educators. Extreme care should therefore be exercised in defining a committee's functions and relationships and in choosing the members of the committee.

Hamlin (1967) indicated that the major purpose of citizen evaluations would be to influence the development of adequate public policies which would make possible more realistic and effective occupational education for all who should receive it in public institutions. These desired outcomes can be had only if the citizen evaluators are representative of the total citizenry.

Puckett, McKeever, and Fee (1970) suggested that in order for the State Advisory Council's influence to be productive and the evaluation functions to be accomplished, each council must develop an amenable structure. Likewise a systematic plan for evaluation which would identify priorities must also be established. They suggested that the various councils develop a systematic plan for total evaluation, which would be concerned with all relevant criteria affecting the field of vocational-technical education. Such an approach would serve to consolidate and coordinate the accumulation of information needed in various studies. Provisions should also be made which would provide for revision and improvement of criteria as they are found deficient.

Evans (1969) thought there was danger that the various State Advisory Councils might collect data for the evaluations in such different ways that they could not be combined to serve national evaluation purposes. He suggested that the Commissioner of Education and the National Advisory Council impose some uniformity on the collection of basic data, but at the same time encourage each state to go beyond the minimum requirements and to develop innovative evaluation techniques. He thought that the information obtained should go beyond programs supported by vocational education funds and should include information about private industry programs, private school training, nonreimbursed occupational education in the public schools, and the whole host of federally supported manpower development programs.

Burt (1969) suggested that the major responsibilities of the State Advisory Councils are in the field of evaluation. It is from these responsibilities that most of the other duties, activities, responsibilities, and status

of the State Councils may be ascertained and derived. The evaluations should be concerned with factors such as state financial aid policies to local educational agencies, financial aid policies assuring provision of resources to economically depressed areas, local school district financial abilities, physical plant and other program resources, the number of school dropouts and unemployed being served, the number of handicapped persons being served, the number of socioeconomic disadvantaged persons being served, the number of youths and adults being served, the total as compared to the number who should be served, and the manner and extent to which the manpower needs of the states and the various economic areas are being served. Burt also suggested that consideration be given to private schools and other educational and training facilities in programs such as MDTA, vocational rehabilitation, exemplary projects, cooperative work-study programs, skill centers, technical education centers, residential vocational centers, opportunity industrialization centers, prison training, contractual agreements with private trade schools, union-management operated training centers, and internal company training programs for private industry. Burt suggested four procedural steps in the development of the evaluation program: 1) The State Board should prepare regulations, procedures, and forms for use in conducting evaluations of vocational and technical education programs in local communities as well as on a statewide basis; 2) The State Department of Education should make arrangements for gathering the data, conducting individual evaluations, and compiling a report of the findings and recommendations; 3) The Advisory Council should gather its own information concerning the status and needs of vocational education from its membership, any subcommittees formed by the Council, and through one or more public meetings, and contract for the services of a consultant who can assist in reviewing the initial evaluation procedures developed by the State Department of Education and assist the council in interpreting the findings of the evaluation report of the State Department; and 4) The Advisory Council should publish its report and distribute copies to members of the State Board of Education, the staff of the State Department of Education and other state governmental agencies concerned with education, training, manpower and economic development, members of local boards of education, superintendents and top staff of local school districts, statewide and local groups of businessmen and labor, the governor's office and relevant committees of the State Legislature. This procedure should both preserve the independence of the State Council and provide for maximum utilization, cooperation, and coordination of the resources of the State Department of Education.

In a joint meeting of the National Advisory Council and representatives of State Advisory Councils on May 1, 1970 the group agreed to recommend to the U.S. Commissioner of Education that a report of an ad hoc com-

mittee (National Advisory Council on Voc. Ed., 1970) which had developed recommendations regarding vocational education evaluation by State Councils be adopted as the official guidelines for the 1970 fiscal year report of State Advisory Councils. The following suggested evaluation goals were included in this paper:

1. Evaluation should focus on the state goals and priorities set forth in the State Plan.
2. Evaluation should look into all parts of the human resources development program of the state.
3. Evaluation should focus upon the effects the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 had upon the state in the year under review.
4. Evaluation should focus upon the effectiveness with which the people and their needs are served.
5. Evaluation should consider the employment opportunities within the state and the vocational education services provided to meet these opportunities.

The following format for developing the narrative report was adopted by the participants at the joint meeting.

Format For Narrative Report

A. Transmittal Letter
B. Summary Statement/Recommendations
C. Evaluation Areas (Sectionalized to facilitate study at national level)
Goal 1:
   a) Items Evaluated
   b) Findings/Conclusions
   c) Recommendations
Goal 2:
   a)
   b)
   c)

(and so forth, through Goal 5. If a particular Council does not choose to pursue a certain goal, the number should appear together with a simple statement that it was not feasible, or not applicable, etc. If a particular council chooses to evaluate areas not covered in the recommendations, these should be stated as Goal 6, 7, etc., and developed along the same format as above.)

D. Optional Appendices

1. Brief description of organizational structure and major activities of the Council and staff.

2. Case studies reflecting sample state programs—both successful and unsuccessful—to provide examples of how well programs can work or to be used in warning others to avoid certain pitfalls.
3. Other background or supportive data, as desired by each State Council.

The Program Planning and Evaluation Branch, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education (HEW, 1970) developed a series of recommended evaluation questions for consideration by State Advisory Councils to consider in developing and implementing evaluation activities to meet the five goals and guidelines established by the ad hoc committee representing the State Advisory Councils and the National Advisory Council. The questions focused primarily on the State Plan and the priorities and intent of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and should prove extremely beneficial to a State Advisory Council in developing its own evaluation framework.

The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (n.d., c.a. 1970) developed a framework for consideration of planning and evaluating vocational education. It identified the principal groups which the National Council believed vocational education was intended to serve, the principal objectives which should be attained in the 1970's, and criteria which should be applied in measuring progress toward achieving those objectives. It was thought that State Advisory Councils might find this a useful index of concerns, at least some of which they would wish to take into account in preparing their annual evaluation reports. The National Council thought that planning and evaluation should reflect the total career preparation picture, including career preparation in post-secondary institutions, MDTA programs, private training schools, employer on-the-job training, and whatever other programs might be available in an area, as well as high school vocational courses. They thought that evaluation programs should consider the industry employment. The primary objective of the annual evaluation report would be to evaluate the state's vocational program efforts as related to the state and national interests, student benefits, and manpower requirements. The major components of the annual evaluation report would include: 1) an analysis of past and current data pertaining to vocational programs on the secondary, post-secondary and adult levels in such areas as: enrollments, instructional programs, facilities, finance, and financial aid; 2) an inventory of the state's long-range program plans and the annual program plan with respect to enrollments, instructional programs, facilities, finance, and financial support; 3) an analysis of occupational training policies and programs which have been implemented to meet the needs of Colorado; 4) an assessment of the contribution of vocational education to the economy of Colorado; and 5) an evaluation of

the State's vocational program efforts as related to local, state, and national interest, student benefits, and quality manpower requirements.

Relative to Policy Assessment

P.L. 90-576 (1968) indicated that one of the duties of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education was to advise the State Board of Education on the development of policy matters arising in the administration of the State Plan for Vocational Education. This duty seems to imply two separate functions: 1) the duty to advise the State Board on the development of the State Plan for Vocational Education which is treated in another section; and 2) the duty to advise the State Board of Education on Policy matters arising in the administration of avilability of vocational education programs to persons in relevant categories, an evaluation of the ability of vocational education programs to attract potential clientele, and the extent to which vocational education is spread throughout the entire elementary and secondary curriculum so that the relevance of much of that curriculum becomes increased and so that all students have more exposure to work concepts during their school careers. The National Council emphasized the measurement of quality of vocational programs and suggested that to the extent possible output criteria be developed. These output criteria should include such things as completion rate, self-image, success (in terms of percent hired, how soon, in training-related jobs, higher entry pay, upward mobility, employee satisfaction, employer satisfaction, and further training and education). An evaluation of input data was also seen as desirable. Input data included such factors as money, facilities and equipment, student characteristics, administrators and teachers, guidance for placement and follow-up, curriculum materials, community attitudes, willingness to experiment, and employer participation. The National Council also suggested the consideration of certain noneconomic constraints including the problem of a negative environment, and the problem of discrimination in the hiring of women, minority group members, the handicapped, etc.

A description of the Colorado State Advisory Council's Annual Evaluation Report (1969) indicated that it would seek to: a) assess the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the manpower needs for business and industry, b) relate the previous years operational programs with the needs and requests of the students, and c) recommend any necessary changes in programs relating to the needs of business and the State Plan. This section therefore focuses on the role of the State Advisory Council relative to policy assessment.

Evans (1969) thought the wisdom of Congress was evident in assigning a duty of policy assessment to the Councils. His contention was that

if these had been assigned to the State Board and the State Board staffs, considerably less attention would have been paid to these activities because they would have been submerged in the day to day activities of the staff. Evans thought the potential for broad scale educational planning and policy assessment was considerable when one considers that representatives of local educational agencies, school boards, special education personnel, and persons knowledgeable about the needs of disadvantaged youth would be present on the State Councils.

Morton (1969) saw that one of the most significant characteristics of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was the creation of State Advisory Councils. He indicated the reason for their creation was to advise the State Boards of Education and make recommendations concerning vocational education policy and administration. Morton saw implicit in the intent of the 1968 law that the state show an effort to relate vocational education and manpower training programs. He thought it therefore apparent that state legislatures may consider one of the purposes of the State Advisory Councils to be that of studying and recommending the effective coordination of vocational manpower programs within their states. Morton illustrated this with the responsibilities given to the State Advisory Council in Texas. In addition to recommending a State Plan for Vocational Education the Texas State Advisory Council was given the responsibility for planning, recommending, and evaluating programs in the vocational, technical, adult, and manpower training areas of education in both secondary and post-secondary institutions. Included in this area of responsibility were such matters as: 1) the establishment of appropriate subjects and training areas in each of the levels of education, and 2) establishment and certification of a list of courses and types of training eligible to be funded by the state legislature or from federal funds. The Advisory Council was also given responsibility to recommend and evaluate the role and scope of secondary institutions, technical training institutes, community colleges, public junior colleges, and public senior colleges and universities in a cooperative plan to develop manpower training in the State of Texas. It was specifically charged with the task of determining each institution's role in adult education, including technical, vocational, and adult basic programs.

Morton (1969) suggested that by virtue of its recommending authority, the State Advisory Council in Texas was in a position to: 1) influence the coordination of technical, vocational, and manpower training throughout Texas; 2) recommend the role and scope of institutions and certify those eligible to receive an allocation of state and federal funds for program implementation; 3) establish courses and training programs eligible to be funded in these institutions; and 4) recommend to the governor and legislature a method whereby these funds may be allocated among the institutions of the state.

Rumpf (1969) emphasized the need for comprehensive planning beyond anything previously envisioned. He talked of the concern for the objectives of the Vocational Education Act and for the common interest in such items as funding, evaluation, research, instructional programs, training needs, persons to be served, educational equipment and facilities, and preparation of professional and other personnel. Of paramount importance, he said, was the involvement of responsible outsiders in planning and utilizing community agencies and groups to supplement the vocational education effort. Rumpf further emphasized the role of the state agency in preparing its State Plan for Vocational Education in consultation with the State Advisory Council.

Relative to Interface with the Public

Dellefield (1970) thought that vocational education, perhaps more than any other type of educational program, required close cooperation with the community. He thought that since vocational education prepared the young and adults to enter the labor force and supplied the means for upgrading their skills, it must be evaluated and reevaluated by persons engaged in the various occupational fields in order to be certain that instruction was relevant. He indicated that for the first time the Congress recognized in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 the necessity for a marriage rather than a courtship between the education community and business and industry.

Dellefield (1970) reviewed the establishment at the federal level of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education bringing together lay people and experts with particular interests in the various facets of vocational education to advise the Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to make recommendations for legislation to the Congress. At the state level, similar councils were required to independently evaluate each state's vocational program and make recommendations to the State Board, the Commissioner of Education, and the National Council. Dellefield suggested that in addition to these, each community should consider establishing a vocational education advisory council with members representing the various interested groups from business, labor, government, areas of special needs, ethnic groups, and the community at large.

P.L. 90-576 (1968) and the Federal Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970), leave the time, place, and manner of meeting of State Advisory Councils to the rules of the Councils except that such rules must provide for not less than one public meeting each year at which the public is given an opportunity to express views concerning vocational education. Thus, the Act and the Rules and Regulations speak to the interface of councils with the public.

Burt (1969) indicated that the legally mandated functions of the new State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education should help integrate local and area vocational school advisory committees into a statewide system of advisory groups. He viewed the provisions of this law concerning the responsibilities of State Advisory Councils as the basis for ushering in a new era in industry-education cooperation at all levels—national, state, and local—in the field of vocational-technical education. He estimated that 1,000 additional business, educational, labor, professional, and community leaders would be given an opportunity to provide much needed leadership for developing meaningful and effective systems of industry-education cooperation in the states of the nation. Burt (1969) indicated that whether a new era in industry-education cooperation would emerge as a result of P.L. 90-576 would depend on the extent to which the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education did seven things. Three of these seven deal with: 1) representing the interests of business and industry in making vocational-technical education relevant to the economic development needs of the various regional areas of the state; 2) representing the interests of the various socioeconomic groups within the state and providing for their special educational needs; and 3) being able to persuade business, industry, and community leaders that service on advisory councils and local school committees is a meaningful and productive strategy for developing industry-education cooperative relationships.

An American Vocational Association publication (1969) indicated that vocational education programs required close cooperation with the community. Since vocational education prepares youth and adults to enter the labor force and supplies the means for upgrading their skills, it must be evaluated and reevaluated by persons engaged in the various occupational fields in order to be certain that the instruction is relevant. The establishment of advisory committees is an efficient and logical way of providing this evaluation.

Burt (1969) saw the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education as instrumentalities for involving so many business and community leaders in vocational-technical education that the very numbers could well exceed those serving on local school boards and easily rival the boards in importance, prestige, and power for effecting change in improvement in public education. He suggested that even more importantly as ever greater numbers of volunteers participate and become involved in public education, sufficient pressures will be generated to develop a leadership movement from national educational and industry organizations concerned with industry-education cooperation.

Calkins (1969) thought that vocational and technical education had a role to play in helping cure the country of its intellectual snobbery. In his address made at the dedication of the Center for Vocational and Technical Education at The Ohio State University, Calkins quoted from the First

Annual Report of The National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. He also discussed the articulation role of vocational and technical education in helping students see the connection between reading and employment, arithmetic and income, writing and self-respect.

Brooking (1969) suggested that the use of consultants and advisory committees from outside of professional education, and especially those involving employers, has been important to the success and growth of technical education programs. He thought the new and special provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 mandating advisory committees would involve many persons not familiar with the traditional language of technical education. These included:

1. Employers
2. Board members or trustees of institutions involved in technician education
3. Local, county, or state political personnel
4. Labor leaders
5. Civic leaders
6. Groups of parents

Relative to State Plan Development

P.L. 90-576 (1968) and the Federal Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) provide that one of the functions and responsibilities of the State Advisory Council on Vocational Education shall be to advise the State Board on the development of the State Plan including the preparation of long-range and annual program plans and to prepare and submit a statement describing its consultation with the State Board on its State Plan.

P.L. 90-576 (1968) further specified that the Commissioner of Education shall approve a plan submitted by a state only after he determines that the plan: 1) has been prepared in consultation with the State Advisory Council for that state; 2) has been submitted only after the State Board (a) has given reasonable notice, and afforded a reasonable opportunity for a public hearing, and (b) has implemented policies and procedures to insure that copies of the State Plan and all statements of general policies, rules, regulations, and procedures issued by the State Board concerning the administration of such plan will be made reasonably available to the public; 3) sets forth a long-range program plan for vocational education in the state which has been prepared in consultation with the State Advisory Council; and 4) sets forth an annual program plan which has been prepared in consultation with the State Advisory Council. The annual program plan must also indicate the extent to which consideration was given to the findings and recommendations of the State Advisory Council in its most recent evaluation report.

P.L. 90-576 (1968) and the Federal Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) specified that the annual evaluation report of the State Advisory Council shall contain recommended changes in the content and administration of the state's programs, services, and activities as may be deemed by the State Advisory Council to be warranted by its evaluation results.

Burt (1969) found that while the heavy involvement of the Advisory Councils in planning and evaluating statewide programs of vocational education was recognized by state directors of vocational education, few had had time to develop administrative procedures for implementing this involvement. Burt suggested several procedural steps that might be followed within a state. These included: 1) the State Department of Education should send preliminary drafts of sections of the State Plan to the Advisory Council members for review and comments as they are developed; 2) the Advisory Council should seek the advice of outside consultants, industry groups, and so forth to provide necessary comments to the State Department of Education on the drafts of the State Plan; 3) when the full draft of the proposed State Plan is completed, the State Department of Education should arrange for a joint public hearing of the State Board and the Advisory Council to consider the plan and present the findings and recommendations of the evaluation report of the Council; and 4) the State Board should invite the Advisory Council to attend and participate in the meeting at which the Board reviews the final copy of the State Plan to be submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Burt saw the joint public meeting and hearing of the Board and the Advisory Council to be important in the development of effective relationships between the two groups.

Evans (1969) saw a relationship between State Plan development for vocational and technical education programs and the composition of State Advisory Councils. He suggested that the requirement that representatives of state agencies for industrial and economic development must serve on the State Advisory Council will bring together these agencies in vocational education for the first time in many states. He saw that a representative of CAMPS on the State Advisory Council would have advantages for both the Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning System and also for vocational-technical education programs. Evans reported that in most states educational planning for early childhood education is conducted by one agency, planning for elementary and secondary education is conducted by a second agency, and planning for higher education is in the hands of still a third. He saw the representation of each of these levels of education on a single council as a positive step in the right direction.

Puckett, McKeever, and Fee (1970) reported that one of the most frequently listed committees of State Advisory Councils was one concerned with State Plan evaluation, guidelines, and recommendations.

In order to carry out the State Advisory Council's functions relative to State Plan development, several states have set up State Plan Committees within their organization. The Bylaws and Organization of the Virginia State Advisory Council for Vocational Education (1970) sets up a State Plan Committee composed of three members who shall maintain close liaison with the State Division of Vocational Education. The functions of the State Plan Committee were to: a) review and analyze the State Plan for vocational education for the succeeding year, b) review and analyze the long-range program plans, c) advise the state staff of vocational education on the development of short-range and long-range plans, and d) keep the council continually informed on the direction of problems and activities related to the State Plan.

The Committee organization of the South Carolina Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1970) indicated that its State Plan Committee would perform the following functions: a) review and make recommendations regarding provisions of the State Plan, b) monitor annual revisions of the State Plan, and c) develop proposed changes in the State Plan in accordance with other committee suggestions.

The State Plan Committee of the North Carolina State Advisory Council on Vocational Education (n.d., c.a. 1969) was charged with the following responsibilities: a) analyze the State Plan for Vocational Education; b) suggest inputs to annual and long-range program plans; c) advise state staffs on development of plan; and d) keep council informed on direction, problems, activities, etc.

Morton (1969) reported that the Act of the Texas State Legislature creating the State Advisory Council for Technical-Vocational Education gave to the State Advisory Council a number of responsibilities. One of these was recommending a State Plan for vocational education. The Advisory Council in Texas, according to Morton, was also responsible for planning, recommending, and evaluating programs in the vocational, technical, adult and manpower training areas of education in both secondary and post-secondary institutions. The Council was also charged with the responsibility of recommending other State Plans in manpower training fields.

The First Report of the Washington State Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1970) reported that the Advisory Council held three meetings during April 1969 to review, comment on, and approve the FY 70 State Plan.

The Executive Director of the North Carolina State Advisory Council on Vocational Education was invited to serve on a task force drafting the State Plan for Vocational Education in that state.

The terms "approve," "recommend," and "sign off on" are frequently heard in discussions concerning the responsibilities of State Advisory Councils concerning State Plans for Vocational Education. These inter-

pretations of the functions and responsibilities of State Advisory Councils as provided by the rules and regulations have caused concern among members of councils and also on the part of State Board staffs.

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORTS

P.L. 90-576 (1968) and the Federal Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) require State Advisory Councils to prepare and submit to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the National Advisory Council only one report annually. This is to be an annual evaluation report. The format for the first annual evaluation report was described in an earlier section of this review. Although State Advisory Councils and the National Advisory Council are required to prepare only one report annually, neither the Act nor the Rules and Regulations prohibit the release of other reports.

As this review and synthesis is being prepared, the National Advisory Council has developed and released two reports (1969, 1969) and several State Councils have developed and released reports. Some of the State Councils used the terminology of "First Report," some Councils used "Annual Report" and one Council published a "Position Paper." Some of these State Council reports are briefly highlighted below.

First Report of the Delaware Advisory Council on Vocational Education. The Delaware Advisory Council report (1970) described the Council's origin, organizational structure, and major activities. Seven major recommendations were made. These included: 1) a recommendation that an inservice program of education in vocational education for professional educators be developed immediately; 2) that consideration be given in the future to the requirement of a minimum amount of professional preparation in vocational education for certification of all new educational personnel; 3) a recommendation that the State Board endorse and support vocational teacher training in the institutions of higher education in Delaware; 4) that the Occupational Research Unit be adequately supported with funds and services as quickly as possible and that the top priority of the unit be the collection, assimilation, and dissemination of data on vocational education; 5) that immediate action be taken on the development and implementation of approved guidelines for the conduct and operation of integral programs of youth activities for each of the vocational areas; 6) that all programs and positions supported in part or in full by federal funds for any duration beyond three years be evaluated to determine whether such programs or positions should be continued or discontinued; and 7) that all programs approved by the Department of Public Instruction and the State Board receive priority in financing so that approved funds reach the budgets of the participating agencies by the beginning date of the program.

This first report of the Delaware Advisory Council apparently was not considered by the Council to be the annual evaluation report since it indicated that the annual evaluation report would be submitted sufficiently in advance of the deadline to allow the State Board to attach comments and reaction.

First Report of the Washington State Advisory Council on Vocational Education. The First Report of the Washington State Council (1970) was transmitted by letter from the Chairman of the Council to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and to the Chairman of the National Advisory Council. The report included the names and addresses of Council members, a discussion of the goals of the Council, and a description of the history of the Council. The nature of the initial report was described as being intended to provide recommendations to the Coordinating Council for Occupational Education (the State Board for Vocational Education) for use in the development of the FY-71 State Plan. A further purpose was to provide the National Advisory Council and the Commissioner of Education with some insight into the activities, problems, and promising programs in Washington State. The Council indicated that this report was not intended to completely fulfill the responsibility of the Advisory Council to evaluate vocational education programs, services, and activities, although it was not clear whether a subsequent evaluation report for FY-70 would be developed.

Seven major recommendations were made. These included recommendations: 1) for full funding of vocational education; 2) for the development and implementation of a more effective information system; 3) for policies and activities which would encourage more strongly the development of programs to better meet the special needs of the socioeconomically and culturally disadvantaged, and those who have left school without an education sufficient to obtain and advance in a job; 4) that the allocation formulas for apportioning funds for the disadvantaged and handicapped pupils should be modified to better allocate such funds on the basis of services local schools actually provide such pupils; 5) that the Division of Vocational Education encourage and support proposals from local districts for approved special programs for high school dropouts; 6) for increased planning and coordinating efforts aimed at promoting the potential of occupational education to enrich the entire educational system; and 7) for reorganization of state agency structures to give vocational education unit status with the head being at the assistant superintendent or assistant director level.

First Annual Report of the State of Illinois Advisory Council on Vocational Education. The First Annual Report of the Illinois Council (1969) was transmitted by letter from its chairman to the chairman of the State Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation. The letter indicated that the suggestions and recommendations in this first report did not reflect the more detailed appraisal anticipated for next year.

The report described the functions of the Council, its organizational structure, and its intended mode of operations.

The Council indicated that it would publish additional findings and recommendations throughout the year. Eleven recommendations were made in the First Annual Report. These included recommendations to: 1) encourage changes in recruitment, curricula, and placement services to make vocational education fully effective for the hard-core disadvantaged; 2) encourage programs and changes in curricula, facilities, and equipment to make fully effective adequate training of handicapped persons; 3) expand support for improved inservice and preservice training; 4) establish a flexible certification code; 5) encourage a program of guidance beginning with the elementary school; 6) continue surveillance of programs, services, and activities at all levels to make sure that a power struggle for students, equipment, facilities, and money does not evolve; 7) support establishment of programs meaningful to women at the skill or craft level, and in technical and professional areas; 8) encourage the development of a rational system for planning, programming, and budgeting; 9) support the establishment of a data processing system; 10) encourage a more positive role in the advancement and development of a broad program of continuing education; and 11) encourage a plan of reimbursement for new and ongoing programs that is equitable to a local community and the state, advancing local and state manpower requirements.

Annual Report of the Arkansas Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education. The Arkansas Council (1970) made its report to the State Board for Vocational Education and made recommendations in four areas: Secondary Schools, Post-Secondary Schools, Industry Oriented Training, and Teacher Training.

In the secondary schools area, the Council strongly urged a major shift of emphasis to include a comprehensive secondary school program of vocational-technical education.

The Council recommended the continued financing and administration of post-secondary area vocational-technical schools by the State Department of Education. It recommended a temporary moratorium on the construction of new post-secondary area vocational-technical schools. The Council recommended that any new post-secondary schools be located where the student, employment, and industry needs were greatest, and that the present plan for future sites of these schools be abandoned, and that serious consideration be given to requiring local participation in financing the construction of new post-secondary schools.

Recommendations were made to achieve a better orientation to the needs of industry.

In the area of teacher training, there was recognized a need for a comprehensive teacher training program in the area of vocational-technical education in Arkansas. An expanded program in a number of curricular

areas, and an increase in the number of teachers trained, were considered as immediate necessities.

Position Paper of the North Carolina State Advisory Council. The first report published by the North Carolina State Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1970) was in the form of a Position Paper entitled, "Professional Development of Administrators, Vocational Education Teachers, and Support Personnel for Occupational Education Programs in North Carolina." This report was not intended as the annual evaluation report for the North Carolina Council.

The Position Paper was originally prepared by the Professional Development Committee of the Council. Its intent was to recognize the State Board of Education and its staffs for professional development efforts of the past and to express the strong desire of the Council for continued, expanded, and more encompassing professional development programs in the future. The committee considered this urgent in view of the new thrusts in vocational education, the expected expansion of programs, reorganization of the State Board staff in the Department of Public Instruction, and the new roles being assumed at the local education agency levels.

The Council encouraged the State Board of Education to appoint a task force charged with the responsibility for making a comprehensive study of professional development needs in the area of occupational education in the state, encouraged the State Board to develop a strong policy statement supporting the need for continued, improved, and expanded professional development programs, and encouraged allocation of additional resources for occupational education professional development. The Council encouraged the State Board staffs to develop a strong and continuing program of professional development for State Staff members; to develop a close and continuous liaison with professional education institutions; assist local education agencies in the development of professional development activities; and to make an immediate analysis of the backgrounds, educational qualifications, and/or competencies of personnel being certified in the areas of occupational education. For colleges and universities with vocational teacher education, guidance, and/or administration programs, the council encouraged a critical examination of current requirements and practices in preservice teacher education programs; development of professional education programs in expanding and emerging areas; closer working relationships with the State Department of Public Instruction and staffs of local educational agencies; the careful review of commitments, policies, and practices concerning inservice education to educational personnel in the field. The Council encouraged the Council on Vocational Teacher Education to assist local administrators in the development and implementation of locally designed inservice professional development programs, and also encouraged the Council to develop an effective liaison between all the institutions training teachers for occupational education in the state and

to provide a mechanism for effective cooperative study and planning and a sounding board for project proposals and ideas as requested.

An Evaluation of Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical Education in New Mexico. In October, 1969 the New Mexico State Advisory Council for Vocational Education contracted with the Bureau of Educational Planning and Development, University of New Mexico, for two vocational-technical education evaluation studies. The report of the first study, dealing with post-secondary vocational-technical education, was published in December 1969.

Six specific recommendations resulted from the study: 1) Continue to operate the four post-secondary area vocational schools at El Rito, Albuquerque, Roswell, and Hobbs; 2) Expand efforts to attract more post-secondary vocational students into the statewide program; 3) Improve and expand support units of the statewide post-secondary education program; 4) Increase financial support; 5) Consider redeveloping the statewide vocational-technical education system in New Mexico; and 6) Continue to evaluate the post-secondary vocational programs.

First Report—Advisory Council to the Oklahoma State Board of Vocational and Technical Education. In the introduction to its first report the Oklahoma State Advisory Council (1969) indicated that one of its prime responsibilities was to conduct an evaluation of the program of vocational and technical education as it existed in Oklahoma. As it conducted this evaluation, the Advisory Council became aware of a number of problem areas in Oklahoma Vocational and Technical Education—financing, curriculum development and modernization, and program coordination.

The Oklahoma Council indicated that as it began its evaluation process one major problem area, guidance and counseling services, became obvious almost immediately and the Council thus signaled out this area for examination in its first report. The Council came to the conclusion that if Oklahoma had all the money in the world to run its vocational and technical education programs, was blessed with all the imaginative and far reaching vocational and technical curriculum innovation, and set the pattern for America in program coordination, its program as presently conceived and operated would not do the best job possible. They cited the fact that the people of Oklahoma are not knowledgeable about the program, are unaware of the intellectual and financial fulfillment of vocational and technical careers, and are engaging in ever increasing numbers in a tragic cycle of sending their youngsters to college to fail or drop out.

In its recommendations the Council called for: 1) a modification of the professional preparation programs for guidance counselors; 2) intensive, well-planned inservice programs; 3) inservice vocational guidance and counseling training for elementary school teachers; 4) an opportunity for all junior high school aged youths to engage in career exploration and to be tested for work aptitudes for careers below the so called professional

levels; 5) more state funds to be used specifically to decrease the counselor-student ratio; 6) adult counseling services to be provided through area vocational-technical schools and through the larger metropolitan school systems; 7) programs to give practicing counselors of the high school and post-high school levels up-to-date business and industrial experience; 8) more emphasis from guidance and counseling professional organizations on vocational counseling and group-type counseling activities; 9) more emphasis on public information activities designed to increase the awareness of students, their parents, and other adults in the wide variety of challenging and rewarding occupational opportunities that exist in the world of work and the availability of training programs designed to prepare persons to enter these fields; and 10) the State Legislature to study the extent and disposition of state funds for post-secondary programs.

PROBLEMS AND QUESTIONS CONCERNING STATE ADVISORY COUNCILS

The Question of Independence

The Federal Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970) provided that whether the State Advisory Council was appointed by the governor or by the State Board of Education the Council should be separate and independent from the State Board. It was also specified that, within 30 days after certification, each State Advisory Council should meet and select from among its membership a chairman. The time, place, and manner of meeting were to be as provided by the rules of the State Advisory Council. In connection with the staff of the Council, the rules and regulations specified that each Council was authorized to obtain the services of professional, technical, and clerical personnel to carry out the functions of the Council and to contract for such services as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its evaluation functions. Such personnel could not include members of the State Board and were to be subject only to the supervision and direction of the State Advisory Council with respect to all services performed by them for the Council.

P.L. 90-576 (1968) specified that one of the duties of a State Advisory Council on Vocational Education was to evaluate vocational education programs, services, and activities and to publish and distribute the results thereof. A related duty specified that State Advisory Councils were to prepare and submit through the State Board to the Commissioner and to the National Advisory Council an annual evaluation report, accompanied by such additional comments of the State Board as the State Board deems appropriate, which 1) evaluates the effectiveness of vocational education programs, services, and activities carried out in the year under review; and 2) recommends changes in programs, services, and activities as are war-

ranted by the evaluations. The comments by the State Board to the annual evaluation report may include the results of evaluations by the State Board or other agencies which support, supplement, or differ with the evaluation results of the State Advisory Council.

In terms of functions and staffing, it seems clear that both P.L. 90-576 and the Rules and Regulations point to independent status for the councils.

Burt (1969) indicated that his survey of state directors of vocational education indicated that they recognized the intent of the Congress to establish State Advisory Councils as independent agencies. He summarized the essence of their viewpoints in three statements: 1) The State Advisory Council is not an arm of the State Board of Vocational Education; 2) The State Advisory Council will not be subservient to the Board of Vocational Education; and 3) The State Advisory Council is an independent group. Burt thought this quest for independence on the part of State Advisory Councils might lead to difficult working relationships between the Councils and the State Departments and State Boards of Education.

Burt (1969) thought there was perhaps too much emphasis being placed on the need for independence when actually he saw emerging a clear call for "interdependence" with all other groups, agencies, and organizations dealing with employment, economic development, human resources development, education, training, and manpower utilization. He thought that the very nature of the interdependence of vocational and technical education with all other facets of the educational system was a compelling reason for the State Advisory Councils to function interdependently. For too long, general educators have considered vocational education as a separate and distinct part of education and vocational educators have stressed the necessity for independence in order to remain in existence. Burt thought that too great a stress on the independent status of the Councils could lead to attempts to operate them as separate and even autonomous bodies. He saw the Councils as being in an ideal position to serve in an interdependent and coordinative role.

The literature reflects little of the struggle currently going on to develop the Councils as independent and separate from the state agency.

The February 1970 NACVE Newsletter (1970) reviewed problems raised in a joint meeting of the National Advisory Council and representatives from State Advisory Councils held in Washington, D.C., on November 1, 1969. It was reported that, as the main bodies to be audited and evaluated by the State Councils, some State Departments of Education were proving "obstructionist" in authorizing expenditures of funds by the State Advisory Councils. It was suggested that to insure the degree of independence necessary to perform their duties, fiscal responsibilities should be given directly to the State Councils through the state treasurers. Subsequent changes were made to allow funds to go directly to the Councils.

In reviewing the development of State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education after one year of operation, the House Education and Labor General Education Subcommittee (1970) under the Chairmanship of the Honorable Roman Pucinski, arrived at the conclusion that funds should go directly to Councils. The committee felt that the State Councils should be in a position to hire professional executive directors and other assistants as they felt necessary to carry out their functions under the law. They felt that Congress, in establishing the Councils, had viewed independence as critical to their ability to evaluate the effectiveness of vocational education programs from a new standpoint. Therefore, the subcommittee recommended, and the full committee agreed to the inclusion of the following paragraph in House Report 91-744 accompanying the unanimously-approved H.R. 13630:

> The Committee is also concerned about the operation of the State Advisory Councils which were first required by the amendments of 1968. First, the Committee conceives these State councils as an essential source of new expertise on the development of new vocational programs and the more effective redirection of existing programs to greater relevancy. Second, the committee believes these councils should be independent evaluators of the effectiveness of programs within the States and independent commentators on the advisability of the provisions of the State plans. This independence, especially from the State departments of education, is essential if the councils are to make sound, objective judgments. Therefore, the committee is very concerned that the presence of State directors of vocational education on several councils and the use of State department personnel by other councils seriously erodes the effectiveness of those councils. The committee accordingly urges the Office of Education to review the operation of all the State councils and to require that State directors be excluded from membership and that funds appropriated for the councils go directly to the councils from the Office of Education to be used at the sole discretion of the councils for the employment of staff and for evaluations and studies.

The above report reflects an area other than funding which is vital to an understanding of the question of independence. This deals with whether State Directors of Vocational Education and other members of State Board staffs could serve on the State Councils. The original ruling was that these people could not serve as members. This ruling was later rescinded, but subsequently reinstated after pressure from Congress.

Mr. Antonio Figueroa Colon, Chairman of the State Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Education for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (n.d., c.a. 1970) indicated no problems in Puerto Rico in regard to "separate and independent" status. He related that "the direction of

vocational and technical education has maintained from the beginning, complete administrative detachment from the Council and their attitude has been one of complete cooperation in the development of the activities of the Council." The most important problem facing that Council was in eliminating "red tape" in the use of funds to hire consultants and other qualified personnel to evaluate the programs.

The Question of Appointment of Members

Evans (1969) reported the conflict which arose when the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 were being drafted and the House proposed that State Advisory Councils be appointed by the governor. Chief state school officers took exception to this with the argument that vocational and technical education were, after all, part of education and that education was their responsibility. Some House members and certain governors, however, recognized that in some states, the chief state school officers were only responsible for elementary and secondary education and not for post-secondary schools nor for adults. They thought it desirable to include these phases of education and education in post-secondary schools and for adults. A compromise was reached with the governors winning the right to appoint the State Advisory Council members in all states except where a majority of the members State Board for Vocational Education were elected directly by the voters.

The literature does not yet reflect the struggles that went on in many states in appointing members to State Advisory Councils. In some states there apparently was a policy that the State Board of Education would develop a proposed list of names to submit to the governor for possible appointment to the State Advisory Council. No other lists were to be submitted. In other states lists were submitted by the State Board of Education, by the State Vocational Association, by other professional organizations or institutions with concerns about occupational education, and by individuals either at their own initiative or upon request by the governor.

Burt (1969) indicated that in each of the 10 states which he surveyed the State Director of Vocational Education stated that he drew up the initial list of persons to be recommended to the governor or to the State Board. In some instances other state agencies were requested to submit possible candidates. One director reported seeking nominees from business and professional trade associations. One state reported that a separate list of candidates was submitted to the governor by the Department of Economic Security. Burt found that the most prevalent procedure was for the State Director of Vocational Education to draw up the list of candidates with advice from other state agencies, submit it to the chief state education officer, who reviewed the list, and submitted it to the State Board for

Vocational Education. The State Board for Vocational Education then submitted its recommendations to the governor. The governor's office reviewed the list, made deletions and additions, and then issued letters of invitation to individuals to serve on the Councils.

Other questions arising concerning the appointment of members included:

1. Should members of a council be representative of different geographical areas in a state?
2. Should vocational youth groups be represented on the Council?
3. How many members should be appointed for each of the categories specified in the Law and the Rules and Regulations?
4. Can one person appointed to the Council represent more than one category?
5. What is the optimum size for a Council?
6. How long should a member serve on a Council and how is he to be replaced?
7. Are staff members for the State Board for Vocational Education eligible to serve on the Council?

It is interesting to note that the California Statute (1969) creating the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training specified that the Council should consist of the Director of Human Resources Development or his representative, a member of the Assembly Education Committee appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, a member of the Senate Education Committee appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules, and 20 members appointed by the governor to serve four year terms.

The Question of Role

P.L. 90-576 (1968) and the Rules and Regulations (HEW, 1970 specified that the duties of the State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education should be to: 1) advise the State Board on the development of and policy matters arising in the administration of the State Plan, including the preparation of long-range and annual program plans; 2) evaluate vocational education programs, services, and activities and publish and distribute the results thereof; and 3) prepare and submit through the State Board to the commissioner and to the National Advisory Council an annual evaluation report which a) evaluates the effectiveness of vocational education programs, services, and activities carried out in the year under review in meeting the program objectives set forth in the long-range program plan and the annual program plan; and b) recommends such changes in such programs, services, and activities as may be warranted by the evaluations. Questions have been raised concerning whether the scope of responsibilities given to State Advisory Councils is limited to these functions named above or whether they could and should be involved in a wider range of responsibilities.

Questions on Evaluation

One of the most immediate problems facing newly organized State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education has been its annual evaluation. A great many questions have been raised. Some of these have been:

1. Who should do the evaluating—the Council itself? An outside agency? The State Board of Education staffs?
2. What is the relationship between the State Advisory Council's responsibility for evaluation and the responsibility of the State Board for evaluation?
3. Should the Council develop its own data bank or rely on information generated by the State Board staffs?
4. What criteria should be used for making the evaluations and where are these to be found?
5. What should the Council do when data are available on vocational education supported by the state, but data are not available on vocational education supported by other agencies, including the private sector?

A Center for Vocational and Technical Education project headed by Starr (1969) entitled, *A System for State Evaluation of Vocational Education,* offers promise to State Advisory Councils in resolving some of these questions. The Starr project conceptualizes a model system to provide information of assistance to states in: 1) redirecting programmatic efforts, 2) planning annual and long-range programs, and 3) meeting accountability requirements.

Spiess and Spiess (1969) edited a technical progress report describing the development of a total educational information system for vocational education in Massachusetts. This project was undertaken as a result of the charge in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 to State Advisory Councils to evaluate vocational education programs, services, and activities and the recognition of the crucial need for the development of an evaluation process for vocational-technical education in that State. The system is being developed to: 1) fulfill the criterion of providing a statewide data base for the assessment of vocational-technical education programming; 2) meet the needs of local institutions in terms of offering viable feedback upon their programs; 3) continue to grow and be flexible enough to meet the increasing needs for evaluation caused by program growth; 4) gather data on the three most essential aspects of vocational-technical education, namely, product, process, and cost; and 5) allow for decision-making at the local as well as at the state level. This system should be of value to other states in developing information systems for evaluation purposes.

Coster and Morgan (1969) conceptualized a model for program planning and evaluation which appears to be relevant to the problems of evaluation faced by Councils. They gave major attention to the role and responsibility of evaluation in relation to national goals and programs, with the recogni-

tion that state and local goals should not be considered subservient to national goals but must be congruent with them. The Coster-Morgan model gives responsibility to the evaluator for obtaining information regarding the magnitude of discrepancy between objectives, which are the expected outcomes, and products, which are the actual outcomes.

The Problem of Communications

Brooking (1969) foresaw a problem in communications as personnel not familiar with the traditional professional language of vocational and technical education become actively involved in advisory committees. He reviewed several characteristics of these people important to effective communication with them. These characteristics included: 1) They are busy people; 2) They are interested in the subject; 3) They have been selected because of their special knowledge or contribution; 4) They do not understand the "jargon" and technical terminology; 5) They are "practical" persons rather than theoretical; and 6) They need to quickly find a common ground of concept and language.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education have been mandated through the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 in all states desiring to receive funds under the Act. These Councils consist of 12-35 persons appointed by the governor or, in the case of states in which the members of the State Board having jurisdiction over vocational programs are elected, by such a Board. The Councils are to be separate and independent from the State Board.

Categories for membership on the Council are spelled out in the Act and the Rules and Regulations.

Functions and responsibilities of the Council include advising the State Board on the development of the State Plan for Vocational Education and on policy matters arising in the administration of the State Plan. The Council also must evaluate programs, services, and activities under the State Plan, and publish and distribute the results. An annual evaluation report must be prepared and submitted through the State Board to the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the National Advisory Council. The annual evaluation report must also recommend changes warranted by the evaluations.

Councils are required to meet, select a chairman, and develop rules which provide for time, place, and manner of meetings. The rules must also provide for not less than one public meeting each year at which the public

is given opportunity to express views concerning vocational education.

Each State Advisory Council is authorized to obtain such professional, technical, and clerical personnel as are necessary to enable the Council to carry out its functions. In addition, it may contract for such services as are necessary to enable it to carry out its evaluation functions.

Each Council must prepare and submit an annual budget covering the proposed expenditures of the State Advisory Council and its staff for the following fiscal year.

State Advisory Councils have been organized in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

This report has summarized the literature on research and developmental activities concerning the Councils. Few research studies concerning the Councils have appeared in the literature. Much of the information concerning membership, roles, organizational structure, problems, etc. was found in mimeographed Council reports, bylaws, rules, etc.

The first "reports" of many of the Councils are being prepared as this review is being published. Readers are encouraged to watch for these as they are processed and appear in *Research in Education.* Reports which are available to date show a range of concerns from the very general to the very specific. It is too early to determine whether or not these recommendations will be heeded.

Research Needed

Research studies with the level of sophistication needed to impact on Council organization, role, status, or other problems have not been completed, using current State Councils, their activities, etc. as the data base.

Studies are needed in such areas as:

1. Status.
2. Representation needed.
3. Role and functions.
4. Relationships to other agencies.
5. Organizational structure.
6. Expectations of councils.
7. Management and staffing patterns.
8. Effective involvement of members.
9. Evaluative activities of councils.
10. Interface with the public.
11. Outcomes of council recommendations.

This exciting area should prove fruitful to researchers in occupational education in the years ahead.

BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

(Boldface type indicates pages which cite the reference)

American Vocational Association. *The Advisory Committee and Vocational Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, Inc., August 1969, 52 pp. (ED 037 573 MF-$0.25 HC-$2.35) **26**

Arkansas. *Annual Report of the Arkansas Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education.* Little Rock, Arkansas: Arkansas Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education, April 1970, 51 pp. **32**

Arkansas. General Assembly. *An Act to Create a State Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education in Keeping With Federal Requirements, To Repeal Section 7 of Act 328 of 1957; and For Other Purposes.* H.B. 419, Act of 1969. Little Rock, Arkansas, March 1969. **8, 12, 13**

Brooking, Walter J. "Communicating with Advisory, Civic, Employer Groups or Other Persons About Technicians." Speech presented at National Clinic on Technical Education, St. Louis, Missouri, March 1969, 8 pp. **27, 41**

Bureau of Educational Planning and Development. *An Evaluation of Post-Secondary Vocational-Technical Education in New Mexico.* Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico, December 1969, 143 pp. (ED 037 565 MF-$0.75 HC-$7.60) **34**

Burt, Samuel M. *Industry and Community Leaders in Education; The State Advisory Councils on Vocational Education. Staff Paper.* Kalamazoo, Michigan: The W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, October 1969, 60 pp. (ED 034 867 MF-$0.50 HC-$3.10). **3, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 26, 28, 36, 38**

California. General Assembly. *Vocational and Technical Training Act of 1969.* Assembly Bill No. 1820, Sacramento, California, August 1969. **8, 13, 39**

Calkins, Hugh. "What the Public Expects of Vocational-Technical Education." Address made at Dedication of The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, September 1969, 6 pp. (For ED number see October *Research in Education.)* **26**

Clary, Joseph Ray. "The Use of the State Advisory Council as Delegated by the '68 Act." Speech presented at the National Clinic on Technical Education, Miami Beach, Florida, March 1970, 8 pp. **4, 14**

[1]Bibliographical entries followed by an ED number in parenthesis are generally available in hard copy or microfiche through the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). This availability is indicated by the abbreviations, MF for microfiche and HC for hard copy. Order from ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), The National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. For all orders, add $0.50 handling charge and sales tax appropriate to the state where the order is originated. Foreign orders must be accompanied by a 25 percent service charge, calculated to the nearest cent. Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $5.00. Items with ED numbers only are available from the publisher.

Colon, Antonio Figueroa. "The Role of the State Advisory Council on the Vocational and Technical Education Program of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico: Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, n.d., c.a. 1970, 10 pp. **37**

Colorado. *State Advisory Council's Annual Evaluation Report.* Denver, Colorado: Colorado State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, December 1969, 5 pp. **23**

Coster, John K., and Morgan, Robert L. "The Role of Evaluation in the Decision-Making Process." Raleigh, North Carolina: Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1969, 23 pp. **41**

Delaware. *First Report of the Delaware Advisory Council on Vocational Education.* Dover, Delaware: State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, March 1970, 14 pp. **30**

Dellefield, Calvin. "Using State Advisory Councils and Committees to Improve Vocational Programs for Rural Students." *In Papers Presented at the National Institute on the Coordination of Supportive Services for Vocational Education Students in Rural Areas.* Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas, January 1970, 9 pp. (For ED number see *Research in Education,* September 1970.) **25**

Division of Surveys and Field Services. *Vocational Education in Utah, A Survey Report.* Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, November 1966, 259 pp. (ED 016 785 MF-$1.00 HC-$10.44) **4**

Evans, Rupert N. "State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education." *In Papers Presented at the National Conference on Methods and Strategies for State Plan Development in Accordance with the Provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (March 24-27, 1969, Covington, Ky.)* 150 pp. (ED 034 856 MF-$0.75 HC-$8.05) **3, 11, 17, 18, 19, 23, 28, 38**

Evans, Rupert N.; Mangum, Garth L.; and Pragan, Otto. *Education for Employment: The Background and Potential of the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments. Policy Papers in Human Resources and Industrial Relations No. 14.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: The Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations and Washington, D.C.: The National Manpower Policy Task Force, May 1969, 128 pp. (ED 034 861 MF-$0.75 HC-Not available from EDRS) **3, 4, 7**

Hamlin, Herbert M. *Citizen Evaluation of Public Occupational Education. Center Monograph No. 1.* Raleigh, North Carolina: Center for Occupational Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, 1967, 189 pp. (ED 033 228 MF-$0.75 HC-$9.55) **3, 7, 18, 19**

House Education and Labor General Education Subcommittee. "Extending Certain Expiring Provisions of Law Relating to Vocational Education." Report No. 91-744 Washington, D.C.: U.S. House of Representatives, 1969, 10 pp. **37**

Illinois. *Annual Report.* Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Advisory Council on Vocational Education, December 1969, 5 pp. **15, 31**

Industrial Research and Extension Center. *Evaluation of Arkansas Vocational Training Programs in Relation to Economic Development. Part I—Occupational Needs and Employment Projections.* Little Rock, Arkansas: College of Business Administration, University of Arkansas, April 1969, 37 pp. **5**

_____. *Evaluation of Arkansas Vocational Training Programs in Relation to Economic Development. Part II—Survey of Vocational Schools" Performance.* Little Rock, Arkansas: College of Business Administration, University of Arkansas, April 1969, 52 pp. **5**

_____. *Evaluation of Arkansas Vocational Training Programs in Relation to Economic Development. Part III—Evaluation of Programs and Recommendations.* Little Rock, Arkansas: College of Business Administration, University of Arkansas, May 1969, 107 pp. **5**

Interagency Cooperative Issuance No. 69-6. "1968 Legislative Developments Affecting CAMPS." Washington, D.C.: Comprehensive Area Manpower Planning System, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Economic Opportunity, Department of the Interior, Department of Agriculture, Civil Service Commission, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor, January 1969, 11 pp. **9**

Little, Arthur D., Inc. *A Policy and System Study of California Vocational Education.* Sacramento, California: California State Board of Education, 1970, 177 pp. **5**

_____.*Educational Needs in Montana: An Analytic Study.*Cambridge, Massachusetts: Arthur D. Little, Inc., March 1970, 84 pp. **5**

Mississippi. "Appointment of State Advisory Council: Membership and Qualifications." Mississippi State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, n.d., c.a. 1969, 2 pp. **13**

Morton, L. M., Jr. "The State Advisory Council: Potential Powerhouse." *American Vocational Journal,* Vol. 44, No. 8, November 1969. **24, 29**

National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. "Framework for Consideration of Planning and Evaluating Vocational Education." Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, n.d., c.a. 1970, 14 pp. **21, 22**

_____. *NCAVE News.* Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Vol. I, No. 2, February 1970. **36**

_____."Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Public Law 90-576. First Report." Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, July 1969, 4 pp. **3**

_____."Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Public Law 90-576. Second Report." Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, November 1969, 9 pp. (ED 036 653 MF-$0.25 HC-$0.55)

_____."Working Paper Three—Ad Hoc Committee Recommendations Regarding Voc. Ed. Evaluation by State Councils." Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, n.d., c.a. 1970, 2 pp. **21**

Nebraska. "Operational Procedures." Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, n.d., c.a. 1969, 5 pp. **13, 15**

Nevada. "Code of By-Laws of the Nevada State Vocational-Technical Education Advisory Council." Carson City, Nevada: Nevada State Vocational-Technical Education Advisory Council, n.d., c.a. 1970, 7 pp. **9**

North Carolina. Governor's Study Commission. *A Child Well Taught: The Report of the Governor's Study Commission on the Public School System of North Carolina.* Raleigh, North Carolina: Governor's Study Commission on the Public School System of North Carolina, 1968, 304 pp. (ED 034 280 MF-$1.25 HC-$16.20) **6**

North Carolina. Governor's Study Commission. *Occupational Education for the Public Schools of North Carolina.* Raleigh, North Carolina: Governor's Study Commission on the Public School System of North Carolina, n.d., c.a. 1968, 19 pp. **6**

North Carolina. "Possible Committee Structure." Raleigh, North Carolina: State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, n.d., c.a. 1969, 8 pp. **29**

North Carolina. *Professional Development of Administrators, Vocational Education Teachers, and Support Personnel for Occupational Education Programs in North Carolina.* Raleigh, North Carolina: Professional Development Committee, State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Spring 1970, 12 pp. **15, 33**

North Dakota. *North Dakota Vocational Education Master Plan Committee Report.* Bismarck, North Dakota: State Board for Vocational Education, September 1969, 142 pp. **6**

Oklahoma. *First Report: Advisory Council to the Oklahoma State Board of Vocational and Technical Education.* Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Advisory Council for Vocational and Technical Education, 1969, 10 pp. **34**

Puckett, Terry J.; McKeever, Ronald L.; and Fee, Edward. "State Advisory Councils for Vocational Education: A Brief Study of Their Organizational Structure and Evaluation Plans." Columbus, Ohio: Faculty of Vocational-Technical Education, The Ohio State University, March 1970, 18 pp. (For ED number see October *Research in Education.)* **14, 19, 28**

Public Law 88-210. 88th Congress. *Vocational Education Act of 1963.* December 1963. **3**

Public Law 90-576. 90th Congress. *Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.* October 1968. **3, 9, 10, 17, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 35, 39**

Ruhig, Theodore F., and others. *A State Master Plan for Vocational Education.* Honolulu, Hawaii: State Board of Education, February 1968, 125 pp. (ED 018 215 MF-$0.50 HC-$6.35) **7**

Rumpf, Edwin L. "The Planning Job Ahead." *American Vocational Journal.* Vol. 44, No. 4, April 1969. **25**

School Survey Service. *Improving Opportunities for Vocational-Technical Education in Montana; Report of a Statewide Survey by a 10-member Survey Staff.* Columbus, Ohio: Cooperative Educational Enterprises, Inc., 1968, 304 pp. (ED 024 799 MF-$1.25 HC-Not available from EDRS) **5**

South Carolina. "Executive Order." Columbia, South Carolina: Executive Office, State of South Carolina, February 1970. **8**

South Carolina. "Committee Organization." Clemson, South Carolina: State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, March 1970, 7 pp. **8, 15, 29**

Spiess, Kathryn H., Ed., and Spiess, Eugene R., Ed. *A Guide to Evaluation: Massachusetts Information Feedback System for Vocational Education. First Technical Progress Report.* Woburn, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, Massachusetts Department of Education, September 1969, 121 pp. (ED 034 071 MF-$0.50 HC-$6.15) **40**

Starr, Harold. *A System for State Evaluation of Vocational Education. Interim Report. Research Series No. 45.* Columbus, Ohio: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, August 1969, 43 pp. (ED 032 436 MF-$0.25 HC-$2.25) **40**

Swanson, J. Chester, and others. *A Gateway to Higher Economic Levels; Vocational-Technical Education to Serve Missouri.* Berkeley, California: Field Service Center, School of Education, University of California, 1966, 78 pp. (ED 019 455 MF-$0.50 HC-$4.00) **5**

Texas. Governor's Committee on Public School Education. *The Challenge and the Chance: Research Report Volume II, Public Education in Texas—Program Evaluation.* Austin, Texas: Governor's Committee on Public School Education, 1969, 161 pp. **6**

Texas. Legislature of the State of Texas. *The State Technical-Vocational Education Act of 1969,* S. B. No. 261, April 1969. **8, 13**

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *Rules and Regulations, State Vocational Education Programs.* Washington, D.C.: Federal Register, Vol. 35, No. 4, January 1970. **8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 25, 27, 28, 30, 35, 39**

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Recommended Evaluation Questions for Consideration by State Advisory Councils." Washington, D.C.: Program Planning and Evaluation Branch, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Office of Education, April 1970, 5 pp. **22**

Virginia. "Bylaws and Organization." Richmond, Virginia: State Advisory Council on Vocational Education for the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1970, 10 pp. **15, 29**

Washington. *First Report of the Washington State Advisory Council on Vocational Education.* Olympia, Washington: Washington State Advisory Council on Vocational Education, March 1970, 24 pp. **15, 29, 31**

West Virginia. *Highlights and Recommendations for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education.* A Report on Summary and Recommendations, Adapted from West Virginia Legislative Study, Charleston, West Virginia, 1968, 28 pp. **6**

Wyoming. *Progress Report of the Governor's Committee on Vocational-Technical Education.* Cheyenne, Wyoming: Research Coordinating Unit in Vocational Technical Education. State Department of Education, June 1968, 25 pp. **7**